



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

6/1

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/588,351	06/07/2000	Roy Childs Flaker	FI1996085	8116
30678	7590	02/24/2004	EXAMINER	
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP				FENTY, JESSE A
SUITE 800				
1990 M STREET NW				
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3425				ART UNIT 2815
				PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/588,351	FLAKERS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jesse A. Fenty	2815	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 6-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 6-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION*****Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Okumura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,260).

In re claims 6-14, Okumura (Figs. 4, 21, 22) discloses in a circuit comprising a plurality of SOI devices, a method for enhancing the performance of the circuit, the method comprising:

Providing a pulse discharge circuit (312, 2103), the pulse discharge circuit having a pulse generator connected to the circuit;

Using the pulse generator to generate a pulse (column 6, lines 28-36; column 11, lines 50-67 and column 12);

Discharging any accumulated potential on the body of at least one of the plurality of SOI devices to a point having a lower potential than the accumulated potential of the body in response to the pulse from the pulse generator prior to accessing said at least one SOI devices.

***Double Patenting***

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 6-14 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of Flaker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,160,292) in view of Okumura et al. (as above).

In re claims 6-14, Flaker discloses the a semiconductor SOI device, wherein a pulse discharge circuit is connected to the source of the SOI device, but does not expressly disclose the pulse discharge circuit connected to the body region of the device. Okumura discloses an SOI circuit configuration wherein the substrate is biased via the body region, disclosed as the "back gate" region by Okumura. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to connect the pulse discharge circuit directly to the body region of Flaker, as disclosed by Okumura for the purpose, for example, of enhancing the speed of the device while decreasing the power dissipation (Okumura; column 4, lines 5-15).

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 11/26/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Okumura et al. fails to disclose any structure for discharging the voltage potential on the body of an SOI device. On the contrary, Okumura specifically discloses that the circuit (312) "causes the voltage  $V_{subn}$  of the back gate region 309 of the N-channel transistor to be GND (=0 Volts)." The back gate region (309) of Okumura is synonymous with the claimed "body" region.

Applicant notes that Okumura describes an SOI-type device which changes the threshold of the device in a stand-by mode. Examiner asserts that this language, and the structure of Okumura, anticipate the claimed invention. Applicant attempts to differentiate the structures by arguing that the claimed circuit dissipates the electric charge to ground before accessing the device. However, "before accessing the device" is relative. If the device is in "stand-by mode," as Applicant asserts and the reference discloses, then that time period is also a time period "before accessing the device." Stand-by mode is just one stage in a time-line of events of the functionality of the integrated circuit. During this time, the body (back gate) of the SOI device can be grounded (column 6, lines 28-31) in anticipation of the next event.

Lastly, applicant argues that Okumura does not disclose a pulse generator. Attention is drawn to column 11, lines 50-67, wherein Okumura discloses the use of a pulse generating circuit in conjunction with the overall circuit of Figure 4.

*Conclusion*

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jesse A. Fenty whose telephone number is 571-272-1729. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4-9 1st Fri. Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on 571-272-1664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2815

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jesse A. Fenty  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2815

  
Tom Thomas  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center